as arbitrators between the input devices and the medical devices. The specification then further describes priority fields that assign priority for the different input devices. The applicant submits that claims 10 and 20 comply with the first paragraph of §112.

The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The applicant has amended the claims to correct the deficiencies noted by the Examiner. The applicant therefore submits that the claims now comply with the second paragraph of §112.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-18, 21-26, 28-31, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tajima. To anticipate a claim all of the limitations of the claims must be explicitly or inherently found in the four corners of the reference.

The claims recite a feedback device that provides an indication of a difference between first and second input distances. Tajima does not disclose this limitation. Tajima discloses providing weighted values for the input of different input devices. Tajima also discloses weighting feedback from the instrument back to the input devices. What Tajima does not disclose is feedback from one input device relative to movement of another input device. This concept is more clearly described on pages 34-36 of the above-entitled application. For example, if a pupil handle movement deviates from a mentor handle movement, the system will provide a force to push the pupil into the desired hand movement. As stated on page 35, line 21, and page 36, line 1 of the application "this is similar to teaching one to write with a pencil by grabbing their hand and moving the pencil." Tajima does not disclose such a concept. There is no disclosure either explicitly or implicitly where a pupil is provided with feedback which corresponds to a difference between their movement and the movement of a master. For these reasons the applicant submits that Tajima does not anticipate claims 1-8, 11-18 and 21-23.

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 19, 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tajima. The applicant submits that claims 9 and 19 are allowable for being dependent upon allowable independent claims.

In view of the above it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1-23 at an early date is solicited.

<div style="text-align: right;">

Respectfully submitted,

IRELL & MANELLA LLP

</div>

Dated: June 4, 2003

BEN J. YORKS
Reg. No. 33,609

840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400
Newport Beach, CA 92660
949-760-0991

IN THE SPECIFICATION

On page 18, line 4, --instruments-- has been inserted after "surgical":

On page 18, line 18, "provide feedback" has been changed to --provides feedback--;

On page 25, line 3, "audatory" has been changed to --auditory--; and

On page 35, line 10, "radian's" has been changed to --radians--.

IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 24-34 have been cancelled.

Claims 6, 10, 20 and 21 have been amended as follows.

6.   (Amended)   The system of claim 1, wherein said first input device includes a first handle and said second input device includes a second handle.

10.   (Amended)   The system of claim 1, wherein said arbitrator[arbritator] includes a computer.

20.   (Amended)   The system of claim 11, further comprising arbitrator[arbritator] means for arbitrating control of said first medical device between said first input means and said second input means.

21.   (Amended)   A method for controlling a first medical device, comprising:

moving a first input device a first input distance to move a first medical device;

moving a second input device a second input distance to move the first medical device[instrument]; and,

generating an indication of a difference between the first and second input distances.